

firms in such tasks as procurement, accounting and auditing.

Bribery and corruption are no longer unmentionables in international diplomacy. A Convention Against Corruption will soon criminalize "transnational bribery" throughout the Western Hemisphere. The treaty provides for extradition of corrupt officials and urges transparency in hiring and procurement as well as laws against the "illicit enrichment" of government officials. When the United States goes to international forums to demand a level playing field it can take Canada and the developing nations of the hemisphere with it. Along with its success at the OECD, Washington is also making headway in getting the new World Trade Organization to universalize transparent procurement practices. Top administration officials want the United States to press for a recommendation at the next G-7 meeting to criminalize transnational bribery—in other words, to universalize the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

The way impatience with corruption is crossing frontiers recalls the human rights campaigns of past decades. Transparency International, modeled on the human rights organization Amnesty International, was formed in Germany in 1993.

Yesterday the guilty's first line of defense was that human rights was "an internal matter." But dissidents welcomed and were emboldened by international attention. Human rights subsequently became a universal watchword. Today opponents of corruption insist that "sunlight is the best disinfectant." During this crucial stage when democracy and must institutionalize or perish, "transparency" may emerge as a banner.

For the first time in 60 years, there is no international danger of tyranny. Our national interest is more immediately menaced today by such "unconventional" dangers as international crime cartels, the smuggling of weapons of mass destruction, drug trafficking, the spread of pestilent viruses—all of which entail corrupt government officials. Corruption has been provided the pretext for tyrants to topple fledgling democracies. Already, pervasive corruption has paved the way for reaction in and around Russia. Today's decisive battles for democracy and development may be fought on the terrain of corrupt practices.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1996]

A DEFEAT FOR BUSINESS BRIBERY ABROAD

The United States has successfully pressured its allies to stop subsidizing corruption. Western European governments routinely allow companies that pay bribes to win business contracts from foreign officials to deduct those kickbacks from their taxable income. Last week the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a group of 26 major industrialized countries, agreed to end tax-deductible bribes. That does not go nearly as far as America, which outlaws foreign bribery altogether, would like, but it is a big first step.

Industrial countries outlaw bribes within their borders, but only the United States bars companies from paying bribes to foreign officials. That noble stance puts American business at a disadvantage when competing for a foreign contract against businesses that operate under no such constraints. The United States has labeled the payment of bribes a trade barrier and is fighting to get its trade partners to end the practice completely. The Administration says it has identified about 100 cases between April 1994 and May 1995 in which American companies lost business to those that paid bribes to foreign officials in order to win contracts in the construction, telecommunications and other lucrative industries.

So far, the United States has acted unilaterally—losing business but having a limited impact on corruption. By bringing the other major industrialized countries along, the anti-corruption campaign will pack more wallop and remove American companies as a special target of retaliation. The best way to fight corruption is to present a united front. That way the pressure on offending governments to clean up their act is maximized and the businesses of no one country are victimized. The Administration's lobbying may not end foreign bribes. But its multilateral approach is smart. •

IS IT NOT ENOUGH TO BE A RACIST

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on Martin Luther King's birthday, the Washington Post had an op-ed piece by a long time friend of many of us, Hyman Bookbinder.

It was so good, I set it aside and I have now just re-read it.

For those of you who have read it before, it is worth reading again. For those who have not read it, they should.

I say this as one who participated in the civil rights struggle three and four decades ago. I visited the South as well as participated in programs in the North.

One of the things that has troubled me is the willingness of some to create a division between the black community and the Jewish community. When I was involved in the civil rights struggle, those in the white community who were most active in behalf of the rights of African-Americans were not Lutherans—which I am—nor Catholic—which my wife is—nor Baptist nor Presbyterian nor Episcopalians. They were people of the Jewish faith.

With the name of SIMON, people assume that I am Jewish and particularly when I get on some call-in radio program when there is a predominately African-American audience, I will occasionally get some of the haters on the phone. I have to add that happens occasionally in white communities.

I am pleased to say that compared to 50 years ago, anti-Semitism is not as great a problem today as it was then.

But we have to learn to become one Nation under God, indivisible and reach out to one another regardless of our personal background.

I ask that Hyman Bookbinder's article be printed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

IT IS NOT ENOUGH NOT TO BE RACIST

(By Hyman Bookbinder)

I'll never forget that moment 12 years ago. I recall it with special poignancy every Martin Luther King Day.

I was sitting in a reserved Senate gallery, and proud to find myself right behind Coretta Scott King, widow of the slain civil rights leader. The senators had just given overwhelming approval to the King holiday bill, which had already secured House approval. President Reagan, after long hesitation, had stated that he would now sign such legislation. So the Senate vote meant that the long campaign had finally succeeded.

At that moment, the senators all rose, turned to face Mrs. King, waved at her and applauded for some time. Mrs. King acknowledged the applause and then turned to her children sitting by her side and embraced each in turn. She then turned around and hugged me. We were not personal friends, but she knew I had done whatever I could on behalf of the American Jewish Committee to mobilize support for the legislation. As she hugged me, she spoke words I have cherished all these years:

"This is your holiday too."

I do not know whether Coretta King, at that moment, meant "your" to mean white American or Jewish American. But whichever, or both, her words were most gratifying because they reflected precisely what I had been urging for years—hoping, and I still do, that my fellow Jews and all Americans could feel that way.

On the several occasions that I had testified on behalf of the holiday, I had expressed the hope that the holiday would not only recognize the extraordinary attributes of an extraordinary black American, but would also provide the occasion for celebrating the unique cultures of our many religious, ethnic and racial groups even as we seek to enhance the common culture that binds us all as Americans.

Dr. King never failed to define his quest for racial justice as part of the goal of universal justice for all people. In his historic "Dream" speech, his ringing peroration called for speeding up "that day when all of God's children, black men, and white men, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the Negro spiritual, 'Free at last, free at last, thank God Almighty, we are free at last.'"

In Martin Luther King Jr., American Jews always had a friend and an ally who understood Jewish agony even as we tried to understand the agony of his people. Only months before he died, he wrote, "It is not only that antisemitism is immoral—though that alone is enough. It is used to divide Negro and Jews—who, have effectively collaborated in the struggle for justice."

That collaboration can and most endure despite some difficult policy differences that have developed over how best to overcome the discrimination and disadvantage and inequality that persist. Dr. King would undoubtedly share his widow's satisfaction in knowing that every King holiday since 1985 has prompted more and more interracial and interreligious commemorations during which his life and work are remembered and commitments renewed to help realize his dream.

In the nation's capital, two events have always been particularly moving. At one, the Embassy of Israel fills its auditorium with several hundred invited guests from the political community, the Jewish community and the black community. Each year, one African American and one Jewish American are cited for their special contributions to civil rights. The other event, a collaboration with the city's principal black churches, fills the sanctuary of Washington Hebrew congregation at a Friday evening Sabbath service. The church choirs enrich the moving ceremony.

At this year's events, the year just ended provides grounds for much despair but also for some hope. The bigots and racists, the antisemites and hate groups are still doing their dirty work. Two much-reported events in 1995 painfully reminded us of the racial divide that persists. When Susan Smith said that "a black man" had kidnapped her children, she counted on anti-black stereotyping to add credibility to her story; when the lie was revealed, black Americans were furious.

And, of course, the opposite reactions to the O. J. Simpson verdict among blacks and whites told us more than we wanted to believe. How many more Mark Fuhrmans were there?

But if there are racists in America, it does not mean that we are a racist nation or that most Americans are racists. If this were so, could a Colin Powell be odds-on favorite public personality in the country? Would the Congress of a racist country enact a legal holiday for a black civil rights champion?

But it is not enough not to be racist. It is incumbent upon all of us to isolate and repudiate those who are. It is essential that we insist upon full compliance with the laws enacted to counteract discrimination and inequality. And it is our responsibility to see that our schools and workplaces and churches do their part in closing the gap between "majority" and "minority" Americans.

All this, and much more, we must do, but not in a patronizing, paternalistic spirit. We owe it to ourselves to help create a society that, as Dr. King admonished us, judges its people by the content of their character, not by the color of their skin. We would all be the winners.

To Coretta King's gracious, generous comment that today is "your holiday too," every American should respond, "Yes, racial disadvantage is our problem too."•

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NUREMBERG WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, about a month ago, the survivors of the Nuremberg Tribunal met here in Washington for their 50th reunion. The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal holds a special significance for me because of the role my father, Senator Thomas Dodd, played as an executive trial counsel at the tribunal.

Those who participated in the Nuremberg tribunal deserve a special place in our Nation's history. At the end of World War II, when the heinous atrocities of the Holocaust were revealed to the world, the inevitable impulse to lash out in retaliation against those responsible would have been understandable.

But, in Nuremberg the hand of vengeance was steadied by the belief in the rule of law. Thus, our triumphs on the battlefield led to the ultimate triumph of our ideals in the Palais of Justice in Nuremberg. This is the legacy of Nuremberg and all those who participated in the tribunal. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a list of all those who were attended the recent reunion as well as my remarks at the 50th reunion celebration.

The material follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, THIRD NUREMBERG REUNION, MARCH 22, 1996

Let me first say what a great pleasure it is to be here this afternoon and surrounded by so many people who played such an important role in my father's life.

My father often said that his participation in the Nuremberg trials was the seminal event of his public life. The fifteen months he spent in Germany, prosecuting Nazi war criminals, defined the type of lawmaker he would become and dictated the issues that he so passionately fought for throughout his career in the Senate.

My father came away from Nuremberg with a greater understanding and fervor for the need to uphold freedom and human rights and to speak out against intolerance, tyranny and violence wherever it may rear its head.

It's why he campaigned so vigorously to establish genocide and crimes against humanity as violations of international law. It's why, he was such a fervent advocate for the civil rights movement in this country. And it's why he fought so hard as a United States Senator to eradicate the scourge of gun violence and drug use from our nation's streets.

While I take great pride in the role my father played at Nuremberg, my appreciation for your efforts at Nuremberg is just as great. When the gas chambers, death camps and wanton destruction that Nazism had wrought on Europe was revealed, you were burdened with a grave responsibility. To not only punish the guilty but to reassure the world that future generations would never forget the horrors and atrocities of the Nazis.

It was no easy task, particularly when the weight of the living was compounded by the ghosts of history that stood behind you.

At Nuremberg, your voice spoke for the millions of innocents who drew their final breaths at Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Dachau. At Nuremberg, your vigor and energy guaranteed that the millions, who suffered so egregiously—from London to Leningrad—would see justice prevail. And at Nuremberg you affirmed that those who committed the worst atrocities the world has ever witnessed would ultimately be held accountable for their crimes.

Reading through my father's letters the frustration and challenges that all of you must have felt at one time or another comes through clearly. But, what is even more apparent are the deep character, humanity and integrity of all those who toiled so emphatically in the name of justice and the rule of law.

I think my father sums it up best in one of his letters: "Sometimes a man knows his duty, his responsibility so clearly, so surely he cannot hesitate—he does not refuse it. Even great pain and other sacrifices seem unimportant in such a situation. The pain is no less for this knowledge—but the pain has a purpose at last."

But as these words remain relevant and enduring today, so too are the legal doctrines and precedents that Nuremberg established.

Nuremberg enshrined into international law the principles that war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide would not be tolerated. It declared that respect for human rights was an international responsibility to be maintained and venerated by all nations of the Earth. And, it held that evil would not be faceless. Those responsible for crimes against humanity would be exposed to the world.

I think the words of the chief prosecutor in Nuremberg, Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, are eloquent reminders of the goals of Nuremberg: The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant and so devastating, that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored because it cannot survive their being repeated.

However, while my father left Nuremberg with invaluable lessons that compelled him to fight for freedom and human dignity around the world, the international community largely ignored the lessons of Nuremberg.

My father, like many of you in this room, left Nuremberg envisioning a world in which the rule of law would deter future tyrants, and where international tribunals would

mete out fair, yet swift punishment to those who would commit crimes against humanity. Sadly, that vision for the future remains unfulfilled.

If we had taken the lessons of Nuremberg to heart, the ghastly killing fields of Cambodia might have been averted. If the international community had forcefully enshrined the legal precedents of Nuremberg, the perpetrators of atrocious violence in the past half-century, from Idi Amin and Pol Pot to Saddam Hussein and Chairman Mao would have been forced to explain their behavior under the harsh spotlight of international jurisprudence.

Regrettably in 1996, the legacy of intolerance and hatred that was prosecuted at Nuremberg lives on in the smoldering suburbs of Sarajevo and in the mass graves of Kigali.

But, commemorating your accomplishments of the past gives us reason to redouble our efforts for the future. Now, just as at the end of World War II, we stand on the cusp of a new international era. We have the opportunity to make good on the lessons of Nuremberg and enshrine into international law the notion that those who violate the norms of basic human rights will not escape from the long arm of the law.

Today we can see those efforts take flight, as the international community is working to bring suspected war criminals to trial in Bosnia and Rwanda. These tribunals seek to punish those responsible for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity while at the same time begin the process of reconciliation for countries torn apart by violence.

Without justice in Bosnia and Rwanda the cycle of violence may only continue. Effective and fair tribunals will silence the calls for retribution and remove the heavy burden of collective guilt from entire communities.

Let us remember that not all Serbs or Hutus are murderers. Most seek only to enjoy the "quiet miracle of life." They strive for simple normalcy. They want only to raise their children in peace, and make an honest living among neighbors in which they have only trust, and not fear.

These tribunals will punish those Serbs and those Hutus who are guilty. But, at the same time it will allow the vast majority of people, who have committed no crime, to work with their neighbors in beginning the national healing process.

Yet, these tribunals serve another effective role: Demonstrate to future criminals that ultimately they will be held accountable.

Some scoff at the notion that international tribunals can prevent future genocides. But, the Hutu murderers in Rwanda took inspiration from the failure of the international community to act after similar ethnic massacres in Burundi. Much in the same way that Hitler took inspiration from the world's failure to react to the Armenian genocide in 1915.

In 1993, 50,000 ethnic Hutu and Tutsi were savagely murdered while the international community did nothing to stop the violence. In addition, they failed to establish any system whereby the perpetrators would be brought to justice. The result was an emboldened Hutu majority, who had little fear of punishment from the international community.

There is no better way to make this lesson clear to all the world's would-be tyrants and murderers than through the establishment of an permanent international tribunal to prosecute those responsible for war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide.

At the dedication ceremony for the Thomas Dodd Research Center at the University of Connecticut, President Clinton called for the creation of a permanent international tribunal. I commend him for his foresight. And I call on all of us, who understand so well the